

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

United States of America,

Criminal No. 2:15-472-RMG

v.

ORDER

Dylann Storm Roof.

The Court, having discharged the jury in this matter, now considers unsealing those documents that the law does not require to remain sealed, and **ORDERS** as follows:

1. The Court directs the parties to submit briefs, under seal on or before March 27, 2017, on the issue of whether the following documents, identified by entry number, should be unsealed entirely, partially unsealed (redacted), or remain under seal: 246, 273, 274, 316, 367, 471, 480, 482, 485, 487, 490, 492, 496, 500, 503, 505, 506, 507, 520, 526, 545, 546, 556, 560, 562, 565, 569, 576, 577, 578, 580, 582, 584, 586, 593, 594, 595, 596, 598, 600, 603, 607, 609, 613, 615, 617, 620, 621, 628, 629, 631, 633, 639, 640, 642, 643, 646, 647, 648, 649, 652, 656, 662, 665, 667, 678, 685, 686, 687, 691, 697, 699, 707, 742, 743, 756, 759, 770, 800, 806, 832, 836, 840, 858, 880, 881, and 882. Proposed redactions should be submitted as exhibits. The Court encourages the parties to confer to identify and to narrow any areas of disagreement.

2. The Court finds the following documents, identified by entry number, should be unsealed: 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 99, 106, 113, 175, 176, 239, 241, 243, 266, 268, 298, 299, 300, 304, 312, 313, 314, 317, 324, 326, 333, 337, 339, 344, 346, 353, 359, 365, 366, 371, 372, 373, 375, 377, 378, 381, 382, 386, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 402, 403, 405, 412, 413, 414, 415, 418, 419, 426, 427, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 435, 437, 440, 441, 443, 444, 445, 456, 458, 461, 466, 468, 469, 470, 472, 473, 478, 479, 486, 491, 497, 498, 499, 501, 502, 513, 514, 515, 516, 523, 524,


525, 530, 531, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 541, 542, 543, 544, 559, 563, 566, 571, 573, 579, 583, 585, 610, 611, 612, 614, 616, 627, 650, 651, 655, 661, 663, 669, 670, 676, 677, 679, 684, 689, 690, 692, 693, 695, 703, 722, 727, 730, 734, 738, 745, 746, 755, 757, 758, 760, 762, 768, 771, 790, 791, 792, 795, 796, 798, 801, 827, 829, 833, 841, 850, and 851. Objections to unsealing any of the aforementioned documents listed in this Paragraph shall be filed by January 30, 2017. Objections must be stated with particularity; general objections will be disregarded. However, it is not necessary to brief legal issues regarding these documents by January 30, 2017. If the Court finds an objection has possible merit, it will order the issue to be briefed as part of the briefing included in Paragraph 1 of this Order.

3. The Court finds the following documents, identified by entry number, should be unsealed, but recognizes they may contain information protected under the Court's order of November 30, 2016 (Dkt. No. 698): 358, 425, 467, 475, 483, 511, 512, 521, 522, and 698. The Court directs Defendant to propose redactions (if any are desired) for these documents on or before February 21, 2017.

4. Two defense motions relating to jury selection identify veniremen by name (Dkt. Nos. 532, 664). The Clerk of Court will redact veniremen names from those motions, substitute the redacted documents for the originals, and unseal the redacted substitutes.

5. Except as provided in this Order, any party hereafter desiring to file a sealed document in this matter shall comply with the procedures set forth in Local Criminal Rule 49.01(B) (D.S.C.).

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


 Richard Mark Gergel
 United States District Court Judge

January 13, 2017
 Charleston, South Carolina